

Mr. President, I am about to conclude. I should like to sum up briefly what I have covered today in such great detail.

First, it is an honor to make this affirmative case. It is long overdue. It is long overdue because the people of the United States may get an idea that we are living in a vacuum and that we do not know what is going on outside these quiet and peaceful walls. But there are riots in the streets. It is one thing to suppress riots when the causes they seek are public disturbance and the destruction of the social order. It is another thing to deal with riots in which people are expressing deeply held grievances from which they have suffered for years—for generations—and which we have been unable to do anything about, but which we recognize as a nation to exist, and which we are trying to recognize and do something about in areas of the country in which there exists this built-in, archaic social order which insists that because a man's skin is black, he is different from a white man and must be kept segregated from him.

Such a situation is intolerable in our present day. It should not exist. It is destructive of the Nation, and of the Nation's position in the world. It is that simple. It is going on every day outside this door in the far reaches of the country. We cannot stand still for it.

We should have full debate and consideration and solve the problem in every way compatible with our democratic processes, but let us understand that the days of the delay add to the days of aggravation, the days of continued public disorders, the days of continued deprivation of the Nation's conscience, and the continued deprivation of the Nation in terms of its economy, which is suffering now to the extent of between \$13 billion and \$17 billion a year in productivity because of the fact that Negroes are not given equal employment opportunities and equal educational opportunities.

Finally, when I began I said something about my own party. I would like to conclude on that note. My party has a great opportunity, just as the Democratic Party has in this struggle. We are the party of Lincoln. We are the party which was founded upon the concept of the free workingman and the urgent needs of that kind of economy. Many people in the South are beginning to realize that it is also absolutely essential to their section of the country.

The pride and integrity of our party are at stake in this struggle. I deeply believe that when the roll is called, and as the various developments take place upon which the roll must be called, my party will do its duty in the tremendous and dramatic struggle in which we are engaged.

I reject the idea that weakening amendments will be offered from our side which will complicate a situation which demands the national attention so urgently. I do not believe that the great majority of the members of the Republican Party in the Senate will stand for such an idea. I believe the great majority will find it untenable, and will reject it, as has been shown time

and time again on votes in the civil rights struggle, beginning in 1957, when the civil rights bill was intercepted at the Senate door and considered in the Senate, so that at long last, action might be taken on the problem.

We are face to face with a discussion of a meaningful civil rights bill which the administration supports, and behind which, in my judgment, are a majority of the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle.

It is said that when a majority of the Senate wants something, it can get it. I add to that statement the corollary that it can get it if it shows the necessary determination. We have the power to act, if the majority of the Senate will show the necessary determination. With God's help, it will.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I commend the Senator on the lucidity and force and clarity of the speech he has made.

Mr. JAVITS. I am extremely grateful to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts for the kindness of his remarks on my speech. I thank him very much.

I yield the floor.

#### THE FALLACY THAT CASTRO IS HERE TO STAY

During the delivery of Mr. JAVITS' speech.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a study entitled "Terror and Resistance in Communist Cuba," which was made public on Tuesday by the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba.

We have been too prone to be pessimistic about Cuba. In recent months an increasing number of people have expressed the belief that Castro is here to stay, that our economic embargo is an exercise in futility, and that the best we can do is to reconcile ourselves to the reality of Castro and seek some way of living with him.

I believe that "Terror and Resistance in Communist Cuba" is the most effective reply that has yet been made to all those who advocate the passive acceptance of the Castro regime because they see no serious possibility of liberating Cuba from its clutches.

The policy of passive acceptance is based on three principal fallacies.

The first fallacy is the belief that the Castro regime, as tyrannical as it may be, nevertheless enjoys a substantial measure of popular support and that its hold over its people is, therefore, secure. It is this fallacy, in particular, that is demolished by the report, "Terror and Resistance in Communist Cuba."

The fundamental fact about Cuba, says this report, is that its people are waging an unrelenting war against the hated, despotic Communist regime. It draws a picture of a Cuba seething with discontent; of a Cuban people who continue their struggle for freedom undaunted by Castro's terror; of a regime that sits on

top of a veritable volcano of popular discontent that may erupt at any moment.

The second fallacy on which the apostles of passive acceptance base their case, is that Communist regimes in general are immune to popular revolt and therefore immune to overthrow. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The fact is that the total tyranny of communism has succeeded in breeding the most total popular hatred known to history. The past 10 years alone have witnessed the East German uprising, the Poznan revolt, the Hungarian revolution, the revolt of the Vorkuta slave laborers in the Soviet Union itself, and the Tibetan revolution. These heroic uprisings failed only because of the presence or direct intervention of the Soviet Army, or of the Red Chinese Army in the case of Tibet. But we have not yet seen the end of popular explosions against Communist tyranny.

The time or place of the next popular explosion against communism is something that no one can predict. But if such an explosion should take place in Cuba, the outcome would be different from the outcome of the Hungarian revolution. It would be different for the simple reason that the Soviets could not send 200,000 men and 5,000 tanks to crush the Cuban revolution, as they were obliged to do to crush the Hungarian revolution.

Apart from the fact that their theory is belied by history, I sometimes wonder whether those who regard Communist regimes as unassailable have stopped to assess the ultimate meaning of their assumption. If the Communists are free to subvert and overthrow non-Communist governments in various parts of the world at the tempo that has characterized the postwar period, and if the free world accepts every Communist conquest as final and irreversible, then, as surely as 2 and 2 makes 4, the whole world will ultimately be Communist.

The third fallacy on which those who propose a do-nothing policy in Cuba base themselves, is that the Castro regime, while admittedly a nuisance, does not pose any mortal threat to our security.

They do not deny that Castroism poses a threat to the stability and security of the other American states. This would be impossible to deny in the light of the bloody campaign of terrorism in Venezuela, the recent riots in Panama, the rising tide of Castroite leftism in other Latin American countries, and this day, at this hour, the ominous events in Brazil.

Nor would they deny that the mere existence of Castroism nullifies the Alliance for Progress and makes serious planning impossible because lack of confidence in the future frightens away new investment and makes for an actual process of disinvestment.

But, admitting all this, they still hold that Castro does not directly threaten the United States, and we should not therefore react in what they consider to be an exaggerated manner to the fact of his existence.

In the old days, there used to be a brand of isolationism which held that

we could ignore what happened to the rest of the world and maintain our own independence, our freedoms, our standard of living and our happiness. It was said that all we had to do was to make of America a fortress so strong that no nation or combination of nations would think of assailing it. That doctrine was known as "fortress-America" isolationism.

It is perplexing to note that some of these who understood the illusion of "fortress America" isolationism, have now become the advocates of an essentially identical brand of isolationism. They appear to believe that our security and our freedoms would not be affected even if the major part of the hemisphere and, for that matter, of the free world were to go Communist.

Castro and the Alliance for Progress are mutually incompatible. One or the other will have to go.

If Castro remains in power, the coming years will inevitably witness the emergence of other Castro regimes in the Americas.

At this very moment, indeed, Brazil, the largest country in Latin America, is the scene of a desperate uprising against the increasingly pro-Communist policies of the Goulart government. It is still too early to predict the outcome of this struggle. But if one major country like Brazil were to go Communist, it is questionable whether the political tides generated by this development could be stopped anywhere south of the Rio Grande.

To say that this would make no difference to our own security is nonsense. An America isolated within its own hemisphere, cut off from its traditional markets and sources of raw materials in the Americas, forced to increase its defense expenditures even over present high levels, could no longer play any serious role in world affairs. If America were thus isolated, it is not inconceivable that internal pressures would lead either to a popular-front regime or else to a Fascist regime.

What this all adds up to is a lesson that we should have learned long ago from history: that we cannot separate our own freedom and our own security from the freedom and security of our neighbors.

Castro must go. That is the simple fact of the matter. This does not mean that we must send in the Marines to depose him. But it does mean that we must be prepared to give our unstinting support, both moral and material, to the brave people of Cuba who have never given up their aspirations to freedom.

All those who feel pessimistic about the future of Cuba or resigned to the fact of Castroism, would do well to re-examine their beliefs in the light of the detailed testimony presented in "Terror and Resistance in Communist Cuba." Let me list just a few of the many facts that illustrate the mass disaffection that exists in Cuba and the incredible will to resist of the Cuban people.

First. Over a period of 3 years, 350,000 Cubans have sought freedom in the United States and other countries, leaving behind them their houses, their auto-

mobiles, their furnishings, and everything they possessed. Another 325,000 Cubans had applied for visa waivers when air transport to the United States was canceled as a result of the October 1962, missile crisis.

Second. Despite repeated military actions against the guerrillas and the execution of many captured resistance leaders, new guerrilla bands and new resistance leaders continue to spring up.

Third. The Cuban peasants, or *guajireros*, have cooperated openly with the resistance in the mountains. So widespread was this cooperation that the Castro regime promulgated decree No. 988 in an effort to cope with it. Anyone caught giving one mouthful of food to a counterrevolutionary, said Castro, would be executed; peasants in areas where guerrilla bands were operating who did not report their existence, would feel the full measure of revolutionary wrath.

Fourth. The resistance of peasants has been matched by the resistance of the city dwellers.

In April 1962, saboteurs burned down the Cuban National Bank Building.

Twenty-four hours later, bombs leveled the chemical fertilizer plant in Cotorro.

Shortly thereafter, several warehouses went up in smoke.

From December 1962, to the end of February 1963, saboteurs caused three train wrecks, to add to Castro's growing transportation crisis.

On March 9 and March 20, 1963, there were two more major train wrecks.

In early January 1963, a large garage filled with scarce automobile parts was burned in the center of Havana.

And so it goes, right down to the present day.

Fifth. Stories of open resistance in the streets, of the heckling of pro-Castro orators, of spontaneous demonstrations in movie theaters, are continuing to come out of Cuba.

In June of 1962, in the port city of Cardenas in Matanzas Province, demonstrations reached the point of near-insurrection, with the people battling both the Young Communist goon squads and the militia. The situation was brought under control only when the Government ordered in the Cuban Army. Castro's TV network recorded this resort to force and broadcast it throughout the country to dissuade dissidents in other towns and cities from following the example of Cardenas.

These items are only a few of the many events that are presented in documented form in "Terror and Resistance in Communist Cuba."

In the face of all this, how can anyone say Castro is secure and is accepted by the people of Cuba?

I think the evidence is clear that the Castro regime is not accepted by the Cuban people. Indeed, I think it would be no exaggeration to say that the Cuban people, in their resistance to communism, have displayed a heroism that rivals that of the Hungarian freedom fighters and a stubbornness that has not been surpassed in the annals of opposition to communism.

The many uprisings against Communist tyranny in recent years and the ir-

repressible will to freedom displayed by the Cuban people, both point to the conclusion that Cuba in the not too distant future will be the scene of another popular revolt against Communist bestiality.

This revolt will take place whether we encourage it or not, because human endurance has its limits and its explosion point. It is not in our power either to prevent such a revolt or to artificially create it. But what we say and what we do can expedite the process or slow it down. And on the day when the pentup wrath of the Cuban people explodes, our action or our inaction may make the difference between victory or defeat.

These are the real choices that confront us.

For several years I have been urging that we commit ourselves to a carefully spelled out program of liberation for the Cuban people, so that neither our friends nor our enemies can mistake our intentions. Let me again suggest the outlines of such a program.

First of all, I would like to suggest that we commit ourselves to a "declaration of independence and freedom for the Cuban people" and to the proposition that the Cuban people should be given the right to select a government of their own choice in free elections, under OAS supervision.

Second, we should make it clear that we stand by the Monroe Doctrine.

I hear much talk to the effect that the Monroe Doctrine is out of date. But the Monroe Doctrine was of very great importance to us at the time of the missile crisis. And, thank God, President Kennedy applied it.

I believe we should again invoke the Monroe Doctrine to proclaim a total embargo on shipments of Communist military materials and military personnel to Cuba.

Third, we should use all the resources of diplomacy, not excluding economic countermeasures, to discourage allied and friendly nations from shipping critical materials to Cuba.

Some say that our embargo has been an exercise in futility. I agree that it has not been as effective as it could have been. But this, primarily, has been because of our failure to make it effective. We can strengthen it, we can make it more effective, first by urging our allies to desist from selling critical goods to Cuba. Most important, however, we, ourselves, can set a proper example by rigidly restricting our own trade with Communist countries in all parts of the world.

Fourth, I believe we should be prepared to give open and increasing assistance to Cuba's heroic freedom fighters, who are daily defying Castro's execution squads. Instead of discouraging the Cuban freedom fighters, instead of interfering with their operations, as we have sometimes done in the past, I believe that we should give them at least the same leeway that we gave Fidel Castro in the late 1950's when he was able to use the United States as his chief base of support and supply for the July 26 movement.

Not only should we support the anti-Castro resistance movement in Cuba, but

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

6577

I would urge that we publicly support the creation of a "Cuban Freedom Legion" in exile, whose ranks would be open to all Latin American nationals.

I do not regard this program as complete or final.

These are only a few of the many things that can and must be done to help the Cuban people recover their freedom and to liquidate the Communist beachhead in Cuba and the threat it poses to the stability and independence of the American States.

For the life of me, I cannot understand the argument, which is made by some, that a Communist tyranny in Cuba, stretching its tentacles into Brazil and into other countries of Latin America, is not a real menace to all of us. Although some urge that it is nothing to worry about, that it is only a minor nuisance, it is clear that it is a very definite threat to all the Americans and to our own Nation.

Certainly a threat to freedom in this hemisphere is a serious menace to the freedom of all, and we had better be about the business of dealing effectively with it. If we do what I propose, there will be no need to send American Marines or American soldiers into action there. Instead, the Cuban people themselves will take care of Castro, if they have our moral and material support.

Therefore, let us make it very clear—and let us do so firmly—that we stand on the side of freedom, that we are opposed to tyranny, that we were not only opposed to it yesterday, but we also oppose it today, and we will oppose it tomorrow, whenever and wherever it appears.

So I urge all Senators to give their most careful consideration and attention to the facts set forth in the current study by the Citizens' Committee for a Free Cuba.

I believe this to be one of the most significant studies of the Cuban situation yet published.

The Citizens' Committee for a Free Cuba is headed by some of the most distinguished and responsible men and women in American life. I hope that their report will be read by all Members of Congress and by the American people generally, so that all of us in America will better understand what is occurring in Cuba and what must be done to deal with the situation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 109 Leg.]

Bayh	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Boggs	Hill	Ribicoff
Burdick	Javits	Robertson
Clark	Keating	Saltonstall
Dirksen	McGovern	Stennis
Dominick	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Morse	Young, Ohio
Hart	Morton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed

to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. SPARKMAN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). A quorum is present.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERTSON obtained the floor.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield briefly to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Michigan, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McNAMARA— TESTIMONIAL DINNER

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Senator PAT McNAMARA, my senior colleague from Michigan, has often been termed a self-educated man—and I suppose that is true. His formal education ended early, for he left high school, to become an apprentice in the shipbuilding industry.

The knowledge he has acquired—and it is impressive—is a tribute to determination, to hard work, to dedication, and perhaps to the principle of self-education.

But PAT McNAMARA does not see it that way. Unlike some self-educated men, he does not see it as the road that other men should travel. Senator McNAMARA's concern for formal education has been more than just enthusiastic; it has been downright zealous.

Doubtlessly one of the reasons for PAT McNAMARA's growing stature—both in this body and in Michigan—has been his deep sensitivity for the feelings of the people he represents and for their welfare.

All who know him well recognize this sensitivity, although sometimes he succeeds in obscuring it with his aggressive independence and forceful comments.

What this is building up to is an announcement that on June 6 a testimonial dinner will be held in Detroit for the Senator. The dinner is sponsored by Histdrut, an Israeli labor organization; and all the proceeds will go to establish a Senator PAT McNAMARA Scholarship Fund for indigent Israel students.

I am looking forward eagerly to attending the dinner.

During his career, Senator McNAMARA has enjoyed many tributes. Reelection by a large majority certainly has been one of them. He is chairman, as all of us know, of the Senate Public Works Committee. He has become closely identified with the search for solutions to the problems of aging. He has worked hard in connection with labor law and for economic growth.

But I suspect that one of the tributes he treasures most was given during the 1958 debate on the National Defense Education Act, when Lyndon Johnson, then majority leader, now President of the United States said:

In my opinion, perhaps we would not have any kind of education bill except for Senator McNAMARA's constant prodding all year long.

So of all the testimonial dinners which could be held for PAT McNAMARA, I suspect that the one on June 6, linked with the chance to promote education for youngsters, will be the one that will please him most.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish to say that the group which will give the dinner will honor itself by honoring Senator McNAMARA.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield briefly to me?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In this election year there have not been too many dinners about which a Senator on my side of the aisle, a member of the Republican Party, could say something complimentary. I hope that the dinner will be a notable occasion. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is a former citizen of Massachusetts. He was brought up in that State. I hope that the dinner will be a fine occasion and a great success.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia cannot claim the Senator from Michigan as a former resident of his State, but I am glad that the Senator from Virginia has been able to yield for the purpose of permitting others to speak.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Montana without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, I wish to join in what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] has said about his outstanding colleague [Mr. McNAMARA]. As the Senator pointed out, his colleague has come up the hard way, but he has been a jewel in the conduct of the affairs of the Senate. He has carried his full share of the load and a little more. As chairman of the committees on which he has served—the Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Labor—and as

a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Subcommittee on Education, his work has been outstanding. I feel deeply indebted to him for the many contributions that he has made and the conscientiousness he has shown in carrying out his duties.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO QUORUM CALLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today there have been two live quorums. One required 53 minutes and the other approximately 44 minutes. This is the middle of the week. We are considering a very important measure. I would hope that from now on Senators, regardless of what particular attitude they have toward the pending bill, would make it a point to be close by and to answer quorum calls as expeditiously as possible. I believe I can speak with some authority on the subject because I happen to be one of those who was summoned by the Sergeant at Arms. But that is beside the point.

Some serious questions have been raised by certain Senators as to the recording of the so-called live quorums. A quorum is present when 51 Senators are present. The first 51 Senators answering the rollcall will be listed hereafter as those constituting a quorum, and not those who happen to be in the city but who fail to show up. I know of no other way to meet the situation which has been called to my attention by various Senators than to make that announcement at this time. I hope that in fairness to all, and in the cause of accuracy, that procedure will be followed by the recording clerk. I hope also that all Senators would be aware of the fact that from now on quorum calls will be accurate and will be based on having at least 51 Senators present in person.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to inform the majority leader that I shall call for a live quorum when I obtain the floor today, because I intend to raise a matter of serious personal privilege. I do not wish any Senator to have the excuse that he did not have an opportunity to be present at the time I speak.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senate is on notice.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Oregon is, of course, within his rights in suggesting that he will call for a live quorum. I would hope very much—and this is merely a personal request on my part—that he would not complete his speech on the civil rights aspect of his talk before he calls for a live quorum. The Senator is not bound by anything which is done by other Senators, I understand, but those of us who are for the bill and those who are against the bill had an informal understanding that there would be no further live quorum calls after the one just had. Senators have been told of that arrangement. The Senator from Oregon would be startled if he had an opportunity, as I have had, to look at the lists on both sides of the aisle, and if he knew how many Senators are not in the city.

I believe it is at least possible that if the Senator calls for a live quorum after and hour or 2 or 3, he will not get it. I do not ask the Senator to make any comment on the subject at this point. I merely had some information that I thought he would like to have before he does what he has every right to do.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have the floor; and I wish to make a statement on that very point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Montana has correctly stated that we are dealing with important proposed legislation. I believe that it is the most important bill that has been before the Congress in my 31 years of service. In my opinion, it is a most dangerous bill. In my opinion, it would take us further down the road to dictatorship. So I was prepared to discuss this afternoon only one part of the bill, namely, title VI, which has no constitutional foundation. It is unconstitutional on the ground of vagueness and indefiniteness.

I sat here for nearly an hour hoping that perhaps my colleagues would come.

Meanwhile I saw a large attendance in the press gallery, and I knew that the Fourth Estate was not there to hear me speak. I found out why they were there. The distinguished Senator from Oregon will speak about Vietnam. He will open up what might be called some "powder kegs." In any event, what he has to say will be news, and it will be in the newspapers. It will be reported.

Under those circumstances, for me to speak for at least 3 hours, as I had planned, would be unfair to both the Senator from Oregon and the members of the Fourth Estate, who have their pencils poised to take down what he will say. I know they would not even put down my remarks with the back ends of their pencils. In view of that situation, why would it not be the part of wisdom for me to yield the floor to the Senator from Oregon with the understanding that he will hold the floor until the agreed time of 6:30? That is the time I was told to be ready to speak. I prepared to speak, and I do not wish to make merely a part of a good speech. I know that the Senator from Oregon has a really good speech. So I should like

to ask the majority leader if he has any objection if I merely take my seat?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield while he still has the floor—

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I might have an objection to his sitting down, but I would not have an objection to his arriving at an accommodation with the Senator from Oregon on the basis which he described. To do so would be most gracious and courteous on the part of the Senator from Virginia. What would the Senator from Oregon think of that arrangement?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in view of that statement, so nicely said, the Senator from Virginia would like to keep his speech for a more propitious time. I shall yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon with the understanding that what I have said did not deal with what I was about to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a Senator on the Republican side of the aisle, I should like to ask the majority leader whether there will be any other speeches tonight or any other quorum calls of which the majority leader knows after the Senator from Oregon finishes his speech.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would defer to the acting majority leader to answer the question. I do not know the battle plan.

Mr. CLARK. I am a little embarrassed to make the statement I am about to make in the face of the crowded galleries. I would rather have made it to the Senator in the secrecy of the cloakroom. But the answer to his question is "No."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first, I wish to thank the Senator from Virginia, but I wish to assure him that not a word of what I say will be written in any newspaper.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If the Senator says what he told me he would say, it will be.

Mr. MORSE. I will make that statement, but it will not be in the newspapers. We have a kept press in this country. That kept press will not print criticisms of the present administration.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Oregon with the understanding that I may continue my speech on title VI on a subsequent occasion.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I am afraid that I may have to object—I would hope that my good friend from Virginia would be willing merely to yield the floor without any unanimous-consent agreements,